10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 8, 19th Floor Ctrm: 25 Judge: The Honorable William H. Alsup 26 Trial Date: October 2, 2017 27 UNREDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED UNDER SEAL 28

I, Arturo J. González, declare as follows:

2.1

- 1. I am a member of the bar of the State of California and a partner with Morrison & Foerster LLP, counsel of record for Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Ottomotto LLC, and Otto Trucking LLC in this action. I am admitted to practice before this Court. I submit this declaration in support of Defendants' Joint Motion to Compel Arbitration of, and to Stay, Trade Secret and UCL Claims. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently as to these facts.
  - 2. Google commenced two separate arbitration proceedings on October 28, 2016.
- 3. The first arbitration demand is directed against two former Google employees, Anthony Levandowski and another employee, and is based on three at-will employment agreements. Attached to this Declaration as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of Google's October 28, 2016 Arbitration Demand to Anthony Levandowski and [other employee], which includes copies of Levandowski's 2012 and 2009 "At-Will, Employment, Confidential Information, Invention Assignment and Arbitration Agreement[s]," which Google attached to its Arbitration Demand. The 2012 Employment Agreement begins on page 34 of **Exhibit 1**; the 2009 Employment Agreement begins on page 46.
- 4. The second arbitration demand is directed to Mr. Levandowski alone. It is based on two non-competition and non-solicitation agreements he entered into in 2011 while he was a Google employee. This separate Arbitration Demand asserts a single cause of action for breach of contract. Attached to this Declaration as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of Google's October 28, 2016 Arbitration Demand to Anthony Levandowski, and the documents Google attached to that Demand.
- 5. All of the agreements at issue in the two arbitration proceedings contain arbitration provisions. For example, Mr. Levandowski's 2012 at-will employment agreement requires arbitration of "all employment-related disputes," including "any and all controversies, claims, or disputes with anyone . . . arising out of, or relating to, or resulting from [his] employment with the Company or the termination of [his] employment with the Company." (2012 Empl. Agreement, ¶ 14(a), **Exhibit 1**, p. 38.) Similarly, Mr. Levandowski's 2011 non-competition and non-

## Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 133 Filed 04/03/17 Page 3 of 3

| 1  | solicitation agreements state that "any claim or dispute arising out of, or related to or in       |
|----|--|
| 2  | connection with this Agreement" is subject to "binding arbitration." (2011 Non-Competition and     |
| 3  | Non-Solicitation Agreement, ¶ 9, <b>Exhibit 2</b> , p. 35.)  |
| 4  | 6. This week, Defendants will initiate arbitration proceedings in the same                         |
| 5  | jurisdiction, at JAMS in San Francisco, seeking a declaratory judgment that Waymo's claims that    |
| 6  | it misappropriated trade secrets and violated the UCL are meritless. Defendants will initiate this |
| 7  | arbitration proceeding based upon the broad arbitration provisions in Levandowski's employment     |
| 8  | agreements with Waymo.   |
| 9  | I declare until penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is       |
| 10 | true and correct. Executed this 27th day of March, 2017, in San Francisco, California.             |
| 11 |  |
| 12 | <u>/s/ Arturo J. González</u><br>Arturo J. González  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |
| 27 |  |
| 28 |  |